

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 616

CS 211 743

AUTHOR Herrmann, Andrea
TITLE Teaching Writing with Peer Response Groups.
Encouraging Revision. ERIC Digest.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication
Skills, Bloomington, IN.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
Washington, DC.
PUB DATE May 89
CONTRACT RI88062001
NOTE 5p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis
Products (071) -- Reference Materials -
Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Cooperative
Learning; Peer Evaluation; *Peer Teaching; *Revision
(Written Composition); Secondary Education; Writing
Evaluation; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Learning; Collaborative Writing; ERIC
Digests

ABSTRACT

Writing instruction reflects a growing appreciation of the value of talk. By implementing peer writing groups, teachers encourage students to give, seek, and react to oral feedback among themselves as they write, in addition to reacting to the teacher's traditional comments on finished papers. Collaboration in writing groups provides writers with an opportunity to read their drafts aloud and to discuss them face-to-face with a peer audience while the written product is taking shape. Studies of peer reaction show both positive and negative effects on revision. Preliminary evidence suggests that the nature of peer collaboration and feedback in classrooms where computers are used to teach writing differs from that in regular writing classrooms. Under certain conditions, computers as writing tools appear to promote a collaborative environment, both in learning to write and in learning to use the technology. The literature suggests that the effects of peer comments on revision is not a simple cause and effect matter, but rather a complex one, dependent upon the interrelationship of multiple factors within the evolving social environment of particular classrooms and groups of students. (Twenty-eight references are appended.) (MS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

May 1989

DIGEST

ED307616

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
DERI position or policy.

Encouraging Revision***Teaching Writing with Peer Response Groups***

by Andrea W. Herrmann

Teachers have turned their classrooms into communities of learners, as the focus of writing pedagogy shifts from written products to writing as a process, and as ways of making knowledge—including writing—are viewed from a collaborative or social perspective (Bruffee, 1983; Faigley, 1985). Writing instruction in our classrooms reflects a growing appreciation of the value of talk. By implementing peer writing groups, teachers encourage students to give, seek, and react to oral feedback among themselves as they write, in addition to reacting to the teacher's traditional comments on finished papers. This trend raises the interesting question of what effect peer feedback has on students' revision practices.

Respected teachers and writing theorists have fostered peer groups in high school and college classrooms as a way to encourage students to write and revise. Elbow (1973) promoted the use of "teacherless writing groups"; Murray (1982) recommended that teachers train students to respond constructively to writing in process; Macrorie (1984) discussed the value of creating a "helping circle"; Moffett (1983) suggested that teachers teach students to teach each other; and Bruffee (1983) maintained that getting students "to talk through" the task of writing is a form of collaborative learning that is essential. Using peer response groups, even with young writers, brings positive benefits, according to the descriptive classroom

studies conducted by Graves (1983; 1984) and Calkins (1982; 1983).

Peer reactions often help young writers

Hence, writing groups, whose activity is sometimes referred to as "peer conferencing" or "peer collaboration," have become a pedagogical tool in a wide-range of teaching/learning contexts. It should be noted that teachers sometimes have peer groups respond in writing to written drafts from their fellow students. (See, for example, Wauters, 1988.) But more commonly, collaboration provides writers with an opportunity to read their drafts aloud and to discuss them face-to-face with a peer audience *while* the written product is taking shape. Class-room talk can be a positive aspect in supporting all phases of the writing process (Reid, 1983). Small groups can help apprehensive or blocked writers become more fluent and can provide an audience that assists the writer in revising (Legge, 1980).

Cooperative writing workshops help students discover audience, according to one study of college freshmen (Glassner, 1983). An ethnographic study concerned with talk in a high school classroom community examined whether writers' intuitions and revision strategies, among other things, could be "strengthened within a supportive classroom environment." (Kantor, 1984, p. 75). The study concluded that the development of a peer

CS211743

community fostered growth from egocentrism to audience awareness, and that knowing the audience helped students become more aware of possible strategies for revising.

Ziv (1983) found a pattern in the way the interaction in peer writing groups develops. Early in the semester, students' comments were primarily positive, but included some criticisms of content and form. The writers, however, did not always revise according to the reactions of their peers, and sometimes resented the criticisms. Later in the semester, however, advice from peers was more likely to be heeded because the students offered each other more concrete suggestions for revision.

Some studies indicate mixed effects

Not all the studies of peer reaction show unqualified positive effects on revision, however. Some studies suggest negative consequences as well. Gere and Stevens (1985) looked at a fifth-grade writing class to determine if the oral responses provided by groups to individual writers shaped their subsequent revisions. The study found both positive and negative results. Student writers were challenged by their peers "to clarify, to provide more detail" (p. 95) as the peer reactors asked questions when they were confused, and suggested ways to improve the writing. Some student writers integrated their peers' suggestions into subsequent revisions. Yet there were incidents of unproductive, even hostile, verbal exchange, and in some groups students hurried through the group work in a "robotlike monotone."

A case study of four children with low, average, and high abilities in writing (Russell, 1985) examined the relationship between peer conferencing and revision. The results indicated that in revising, poor writers were dependent on the questions of other students, whereas average and good writers tended to become their own audience and revise on their own.

Another case study conducted with college freshmen (Berkenkotter, 1983, 1984) sought to find out how students interact in their writing groups and whether writers improve their texts as a result of the interactions. The research revealed that the students' attitudes toward assistance from their peers varied considerably, as did the writers' approaches toward revision. One student, Stan, was too immature to heed his audience. Another stu-

dent, Joann, became vulnerable to unwarranted criticism because she was so sensitive to her peer audience. Although a third student, Pat, felt responsible to his audience, he felt a greater obligation to his emerging text and revised independently of peer suggestions. The study concluded that students writing for an audience of peers do not necessarily benefit from their peers' suggestions.

Peer reaction seems to work in computer-assisted instruction

Preliminary evidence suggests that the nature of peer collaboration and feedback in classrooms where computers are used to teach writing differs from that in regular writing classrooms. Under certain conditions, computers as writing tools appear to promote a collaborative environment, both in learning to write and in learning to use the technology (Daiute, 1986; Dickinson, 1986; Herrmann, 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Hocking and Visniesky, 1983; Selfe and Wahlstrom, 1985; Sudol, 1985).

In a classroom of first and second grade children, the computer created a whole new social organization that affected the way the children interacted (Dickinson, 1986). An ethnographic study that described a high school classroom (Herrmann 1985b, 1986) found a similar result. A variety of types of peer collaborations developed, having various kinds of influence on writing and revision; but not all students learned to collaborate successfully. The success the students had in revising their work appeared to depend, in part, on their ability to form effective collaborative relationships.

The literature suggests that the effects of peer comments on revision is not a simple cause and effect matter, but rather a complex one, dependent upon the interrelationship of multiple factors within the evolving social environment of particular classrooms and groups of students. While some of the students studied appeared to benefit from the comments of their peers, not all students in all classrooms did. Some students were unable, unwilling, or even ill-advised to follow peer reactions in revising what they had written. While there may be no one-to-one relationship between peer comments and revision, these studies, particularly the qualitative ones, suggest a range of real

and potential benefits for students participating in an effective community of responsive peers.

References

- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their audiences: Case studies of the revising decisions of three college freshmen." Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 236 618]
- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their sense of authority over texts," *College Composition and Communication*, 35, (3) 1984, pp. 312-319.
- Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts." In *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking*, pp. 159-169. Janice N. Hays, et al. (Eds.) Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 261 pp. [ED 233 366]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. "A study of children's rewriting." Final Report for NCTE Research Foundation project No. 80:11, 1982. 405 pp. [ED 229 750]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. *Lessons from a Child: On the Teaching and Learning of Writing*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983. [ED 263 614; not available from EDRS]
- Daiute, Colette. "Do 1 and 1 make 2? Patterns of influence by collaborative authors," *Written Communication*, 3, (3) 1986, pp. 382-408.
- Dickinson, David K. "Cooperation, collaboration, and a computer: Integrating a computer into a first-second grade writing program," *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, (4) 1986, pp. 357-378.
- Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford, 1973.
- Faigley, Lester. "Nonacademic writing: The social perspective." In *Writing in Nonacademic Settings*, pp. 231-340. Less Odell and Dixie Goswami (Eds.) New York: Guilford Press, 1985.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, and Stevens, Ralph S. "The language of writing groups: How oral response shapes revision." In *The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision*, Sara Warshauer Freedman (Ed.), pp. 85-105. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985. [Ed 265 553; not available from EDRS]
- Glassner, Benjamin M. "Discovering audience/inventing purpose: A case study of revision in a cooperative writing workshop." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 9 pp. [ED 227 513]
- Graves, Donald H. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983.
- Graves, Donald H. *A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1984.
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Collaboration in a high school computers and writing class: An ethnographic study." Paper presented at the 36th Annual Meeting of the College Composition and Communication Conference, 1985a. 19 pp. [ED 258 256]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Using the computer as a writing tool: Ethnography of a high school writing class," Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1985b. [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1986, No. 86-02, 051]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "An ethnographic study of a high school writing class using computers: Marginal, technically proficient, and productive learners." In *Writing at Century's End: Essays on Computer-Assisted Composition*, pp. 79-91. Lisa Gerrard (Ed.) New York: Random House, 1986.
- Hocking, Joan, and Visniesky, Cheryl. "Incorporating the microcomputer into the traditional English classroom." Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Northeast Regional Conference on English in the Two-Year College, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 240 612]
- Kantor, Kenneth J. "Classroom contexts and the development of writing intuitions: An ethnographic case study." In *New Directions in Composition Research*, pp. 72-94. New York: Guilford, 1984. [ED 250 682]
- Legge, Anne L. "Small groups in college writing classes: Why and how," 1980. [ED 204 803]
- Macrorie, Ken. *Writing to be Read*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1984.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983.
- Murray, Donald. *Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching*. Upper Montclair,

New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1982. [ED 230 962; not available from EDRS]

Reid, Louann. "Talking: The neglected part of the writing process." Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Conference, 1983. 10 pp. [ED 229 762]

Russell, Connie. "Peer conferencing and writing revision: A study of the relationship." Service Bulletin No. 48, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, 1985. 25 pp. [ED 260 392]

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Wahlstrom, Billie J. "An emerging rhetoric of collaboration: Computers and the composing process." Paper presented at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1985. 19 pp. [ED 261 384]

Sudol, Ronald A. "Applied word processing: Notes on authority, responsibility, and revision in a workshop model," *College Composition and Communication*, 36, (3) 1985, pp. 331-335.

Wauters, Joan K. "Non-confrontational critiquing pairs: An alternative to verbal peer response groups," *Writing Instructor*, 7, (3-4) 1988, pp. 156-165.

Ziv, Nina D. "Peer groups in the composition classroom: A case study." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 11 pp. [ED 229 799]

**ERIC Clearinghouse on
Reading and Communication Skills
Indiana University
Smith Research Center
2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 855-5847**

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. R188062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.